Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04525 01 OF 02 221430Z

50
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 EURE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-11 L-03 ACDA-19 NSAE-00 PA-04

RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SAM-01 INRE-00

DRC-01 AEC-11 AECE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 SS-20 NSC-07 /135 W
---------- 020618
O R 221310Z AUG 74
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 7235
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 4525

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PFOR, PARM, NATO
SUBJECT: CSCE: AUGUST 20 POLADS DISCUSSION ON CBMS

GENEVA FOR CSCE DEL

REF: (A) STATE 181101 (B) USNATO 4396 (C) USNATO 4356

SUMMARY: ON AUGUST 20, POLADS AGREED THAT UK PAPER WITH U.S. - SUGGESTED MODIFICATION AND SOME FRG COMMENTS WOULD SERVE AS BASIS FOR AN IS DRAFT THAT WILL AT LEAST FOCUS FURTHER POLADS CBMS DISCUSSIONS. ALLIES STILL RESIST IDEA OF A SPECIFIC DETAILED WRITTEN REPORT BY POLADS TO THE COUNCIL. END SUMMARY.

1. BELGIAN REP OPENED POLADS AUGUST 20 DISCUSSION OF CBMS BY CIRCULATING LONG PAPER ON MILITARY ASPECTS OF SECURITY, INCLUDING CBMS, WHICH HE DESCRIBED AS A REFERENCE DOCUMENT (MISSION POUCHING BELGIAN PAPER TO ADDRESSEES). BELGIAN REP ALSO GAVE SOME "GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS" WHICH HIS GOVERNMENT FELT SHOULD GUIDE NATO DELIBERATIONS ON CBMS, NOTABLY:
(A) POSITIONS SHOULD BE CAPABLE OF IMPLEMENTATION;
(B) NATO SHOULD TAKE ACCOUNT OF NEUTRALS' AND ROMANIANS'
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04525 01 OF 02 221430Z

INTERESTS; (C) THERE SHOULD BE AN OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY MANEUVERS (I.E. BELGIUM REJECTS SOVIET VOLUNTARISM THESIS); (D) CBMS SHOULD BE EFFECTIVE AND THE MILITARY COMMITTEE'S ADVICE SHOULD BE SOUGHT TO ENSURE EFFECTIVENESS; (E) SENSITIVE

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

PROBLEM OF NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS NEEDS TO BE SOLVED;
(F) BELGIUM OPPOSES DISCUSSION OF CBMS IN A CSCE FOLLOW-UP
PHASE.

2. PER REF A, U.S. REP PRESENTED AND EXPLAINED OUR PROPOSED
TEXTUAL CHANGES TO UK DRAFT AND OUR SUGGESTED ANNEX. HE
STRESSED THAT U.S. DOES NOT SHARE UK VIEW THAT BASIS FOR
NEGOTIATING THE NATO POSITION IS TOO DELICATE TO COMMIT TO
WRITING. RATHER, WE FEEL THAT THE CURRENT NATO EXERCISE IS
AIMED AT REACHING A COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF ESSENTIALS INCLUDING
PARAMETERS FOR CBMS, AND THEREFORE WE REQUEST THAT POLADS WORK
TOWARDS A SPECIFIC WRITTEN REPORT TO THE NAC.

3. UK REP RESPONDED THAT BRITISH PAPER WAS INTENDED AS A
CONTRIBUTION TO POLADS' DISCUSSION OF CBMS, AND UK HAD NOT
PLANNED THAT ITS PAPER WOULD BE PRESENTED TO NAC. IN FACT, HMG
HAD RESERVATIONS ABOUT POLADS SUBMITTING A DETAILED REPORT TO
THE NAC. THE UK ATTACHED CONSIDERABLE IMPORTANCE TO THE LAST
SENTENCE ITS PAPER AND WOULD OPPOSE DELETION. REFERRING TO
CRITICISM EXPRESSED THE PREVIOUS WEEK (REF B) OF THE UK
SUGGESTION THAT SOME WORK ON CBMS MIGHT TAKE PLACE IN A
CSCE FOLLOW-UP PHASE, UK REP STRESSED HIS GOVERNMENT'S
VIEW THAT THE BRITISH SUGGESTION DID NOT MEAN ABANDONING
CBMS UNTIL A FOLLOW-UP PHASE BUT MERELY HOLDING OPEN THE
POSSIBILITY OF LATER IMPROVEMENTS.

4. THE FRG REP (READING FROM INSTRUCTIONS) SAID THAT HIS
GOVERNMENT SHARED THE VIEW EXPRESSED THE PREVIOUS WEEK BY
THE TURKISH REP THAT NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS WAS AN
IMPORTANT ISSUE AND SHOULD BE TAKEN UP BY NATO. TURNING
TO UK PAPER, THE FRG REP SAID IT WAS A GOOD BASIS FOR
DISCUSSION AND HIS GOVERNMENT AGREED WITH THE OBJECTIVES
OUTLINED IN PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE PAPER. IN PARAGRAPH 2, THE
FRG REP SUGGESTED DELETION OF THE WORDS "IN PRACTICE" IN
LINE 2. HE OBJECTED TO THE PHRASE "THIS POSSIBILITY SHOULD
BE LEFT OPEN" IN THE BRITISH PAPER'S PARAGRAPH 3 ON
MOVEMENTS, SAYING FRG WAS FIRMLY AGAINST ANY DISCUSSION OF
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 04525 01 OF 02 221430Z

CBMS IN A FOLLOW-UP CSCE PHASE. HE DESCRIBED THE UK PAPER'S
TREATMENT OF THE EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS (PARAGRAPH 4) AS
WEAK AND VAGUE, AND NOT MEASURING UP TO THE LANGUAGE AGREED
TO IN GENEVA. ON PARAGRAPH 6D, THE FRG REP EXPRESSED
RESERVATIONS ON THE PHRASE "OR LEVELS" OF MILITARY MANEUVERS,
ON THE GROUNDS THAT THIS CAME CLOSE TO INTRODUCING A CONCEPT
OF THRESHOLD VALUES ON WHICH NO AGREEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED
WITHIN NATO.

5. THE ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVE GAVE A PERSONAL VIEW THAT
THE U.S. - SUGGESTED LANGUAGE FOR PARAGRAPHS 2 AND 3 WAS AN
IMPROVEMENT OVER THE BRITISH TEXT BECAUSE IT WAS MORE
SPECIFIC. HE ALSO CONFIRMED, UPON INSTRUCTIONS, THE VIEW HE

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

HAD EXPRESSED THE PREVIOUS WEEK OBJECTING TO VOLUNTARY NOTIFICATION OF SEPARATE AIR AND NAVAL MANEUVERS.

6. THE GREEK REP OPPOSED ANY FORM OF WRITTEN REPORT ON CBMS TO THE NAC, AND PROPOSED AN ORAL REPORT BY THE POLADS CHAIRMAN. HE ALSO ASKED THE U.S. REP TO SPELL OUT WHAT THE U.S. HAD IN MIND BY "MUST BE FORMULATED WITH SPECIAL CONCERN FOR THE NEEDS OF THE FLANK STATES)" (PARAGRAPH 2 OF U.S. PROPOSAL FOR RE-DRAFT OF "SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES" SECTION OF UK PAPER). U.S. REP SAID THIS WORDING WAS STRAIGHTFORWARD. HOW TO ACHIEVE THIS AIM WAS OPEN TO DISCUSSION AND HE WOULD SEEK WASHINGTON'S INTERPRETATION.

7. THE TURKISH REP SAID HE BASICALLY AGREED WITH THE VIEWS OF THE U.S. AND ITALIAN REPS, BUT ADDED THAT HE OPPOSED A PAPER WHICH WOULD CONTAIN PRECISE TEXTUAL LANGUAGE WHICH MIGHT TIE THE HANDS OF THE GENEVA NEGOTIATORS, NOTING THAT THE NATO CAUCUS IN GENEVA HAD AGREED ON THE NEED FOR NEGOTIATING FLEXIBILITY. CONCERNING SPECIFIC POINTS IN THE U.S. - SUGGESTED ANNEX, HE HAD DIFFICULTIES WITH THE FORMULATION OF "WITHIN 700 KILOMETERS OF THEIR BORDER WITH ANY OTHER PARTICIPATING STATE" GIVEN THE REALITIES OF TURKISH GEOGRAPHY. ON THE SIZE AND DEFINITION OF MANEUVERS, THE TURKISH AUTHORITIES INSIST THESE INCLUDE AMPHIBIOUS FORCES.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 04525 02 OF 02 221457Z

50
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 EURE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-11 L-03 ACDA-19 NSAE-00 PA-04

RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SAM-01 INRE-00

DRC-01 AEC-11 AECE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 SS-20 NSC-07 /135 W
---------- 020956
O R 221310Z AUG 74
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 7236
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 4525

8. THE ACTING CHAIRMAN (KILLHAM) NOTED THAT THERE WAS A WIDE RANGE OF VIEWS AMONG DELEGATIONS AS TO THE FORM A POLADS REPORT TO THE NAC ON CBMS SHOULD TAKE. SOME DELEGATIONS PREFERRED SIMPLY AN ORAL REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN; OTHERS PREFERRED A GENERAL REPORT; OTHERS PROPOSED A

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

DETAILED WRITTEN REPORT FROM THE POLADS TO THE NAC.

9. U.S. REP SUGGESTED IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO DECIDE IMMEDIATELY ON THE FORM THE POLADS REPORT TO NAC ON CBMS WOULD TAKE, BUT THAT POLADS SHOULD FOCUS THEIR FUTURE DISCUSSIONS ON A COMMON DOCUMENT. HE PROPOSED THAT THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF PREPARE A "BLUE" WHICH WOULD PULL TOGETHER THE SPECIFIC TEXTS AND TARGET THE VARIOUS VIEWS EXPRESSED ON SPECIFIC SUBSTANTIVE FORMULATIONS. IN ADDITION, HE SUGGESTED THAT POLADS INCREASE THE FREQUENCY OF THEIR DISCUSSIONS ON CBMS AND NOT LIMIT TO ONCE-A-WEEK SESSIONS.

10. THE U.S. SUGGESTIONS MET GENERAL APPROVAL, AND THE ACTING CHAIRMAN SAID THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF WOULD PREPARE A DRAFT ASAP. THE MEETING AGREED THAT POLADS WOULD DISCUSS CBMS AS FREQUENTLY AS REQUIRED.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04525 02 OF 02 221457Z

11. THE UK REP SAID HE WISHED TO HAVE A MILITARY COMMITTEE VIEW ON THE REALISM OF A NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD OF 20,000, AS PROPOSED BY THE U.S. THE MILITARY COMMITTEE REP SAID HE COULD GIVE NO OFFICIAL MC VIEW ON THIS QUESTION, BUT HOPED TO BE ABLE TO GIVE AN INFORMAL IMS OPINION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. THE NETHERLANDS REP WONDERED WHETHER 20,000 MAN THRESHOLD WAS REALISTIC IN A NATO CONTEXT, NOTING THAT VERY FEW NATO MANEUVERS INVOLVED AS MANY AS 20,000 MEN.

12. THE UK REP EXPRESSED APPREHENSION THAT THE U.S. - SUGGESTED ANNEX, IN ITS REFERENCE TO TERRITORIAL WATERS AS PART OF THE AREA OF NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS, COULD IMPLY AN OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY SEPARATE NAVAL MANEUVERS. THE TURKISH REP COUNTERED THAT PARAGRAPH ON "AREA" IN U.S. FORMULATION HAD TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH PRECEEDING PARAGRAPH ON "SIZE AND DEFINITION".

13. COMMENT AND ACTION REQUESTED:
MAIN ACCOMPLISHENT OF AUGUST 20 POLADS WAS MOVEMENT AWAY FROM VAGUE REPETITION OF KNOWN POSITIONS AND FROM DOCUMENTS WHICH SERVE ONLY AS BASIS FOR DISCUSSIONS, AND TOWARD AGREEMENT TO DO SPECIFIC WORK ON COMMON DOCUMENT. MISSION BELIEVES IT BEST TO DELAY DISCUSSION OF STATUS OF RESULTING PAPER UNTIL WE ARE FURTHER ALONG IN SPECIFIC DISCUSSION AND HAVE A PAPER WITH BRACKETS AND FOOTNOTES. MISSION WILL FORWARD IS DRAFT AS SOON AS RECEIVED. MEANWHILE WOULD APPRECIATE (A) GENERAL GUIDANCE ON HOW BEST TO DEAL WITH ALLIED RESISTANCE TO RECORDING SPECIFIC TEXTUAL WORDING AND FIGURES OR RANGES OF FIGURES AND (B) SPECIFIC GUIDANCE ON POINTS RAISED BY ALLIES SUCH AS GREEK REQUEST FOR AMPLIFICATION OF "SPECIAL CONCERN FOR THE NEEDS OF THE FLANK STATES" IN PARA (2) OF U.S. TEXT. RUMSFELD

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 22 AUG 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO04525
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740888/abbrywsv.tel
Line Count: 218
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) STATE 181101 (B) USNATO 4396 (C) USNATO 4356
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 APR 2002 by martinml>; APPROVED <03-Oct-2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: AUGUST 20 POLADS DISCUSSION ON CBMS
TAGS: PFOR, PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO GENEVA
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005